GUIDE STEPS FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

What is a performance indicator?

A performance indicator (PI) is not a compliance item but rather a guidepost for student achievement and program quality. The indicators capture the major components of IDEA '97 by looking at the LEA through a "macroscope" rather than a microscope.

How were the standards set?

A standard is identified for each PI. Some of the standards were derived from statewide historical information – such as the percent of special education students in the general school population. Others were selected because they meet requirements of state or federal statutes or regulations – such as percent of evaluations completed with 60 days of consent. Several are benchmarked against what is occurring with the general population – such a graduation rate. Others are simply a "good starting point" and will be refined as we see actual performance statewide.

What do we do with the information?

The following guide steps provide information about how to use the performance indications to build a program improvement plan to address quality outcomes for students and families. The program improvement plan (PIP) is used in conjunction with the corrective action plan (CAP) that is required to address compliance items.

Who develops the program improvement plan?

The LEA should use a team approach to evaluating itself using the performance indicators. The composition of the team is left to the LEA (in conjunction with the ESS specialist) to determine but should represent the major constituency groups interested in special education services within the LEA.

What if we don't have the information about our school?

Not all schools will have data available for all performance indicators, however most will have a significant number. The LEA team, in conjunction with the ADE monitoring team, should decide if any missing performance indicators should be collected as part of the PIP. If the team feels that the most critical information is already available to them and they do not need the missing data to develop an effective PIP, they can move ahead without any additional steps.

If, however, there are a number of missing data points and these correspond with similar concerns raised through the monitoring process, the Program Improvement Plan must address the building of an information collection system that effectively supplies the data. After the data are available, the team must revisit the PIP and revise as appropriate.

Standard	Performance Indicator
50%	Percent of eligible preschool children receiving services by their 3 rd birthday in relation to currently enrolled preschool children.
00/ 40 00/	Analysis: If the standard was not met, the following should be reflected upon: 1. The public awareness campaign 2. Outreach to private schools 3. Screening efforts in conjunction with daycare and Head Start centers 4. Training of staff related to LEA responsibilities
8%-12.9%	Percent of special education population within the LEA in relation to the general student population.
	Analysis: If the LEA falls below the standard on this PI, the team should consider the following:
	 Effectiveness of child identification methods currently employed; Referral rates for special education beyond the 4th grade; For charter schools, public relations information and enrollment procedures; Level of commitment to serve students with disabilities.
	If the LEA exceeds the standard on this PI, the team should consider the following: 1. Effectiveness of child study teams or teacher assistance teams;
	 2. Linguistic and cultural appropriateness of assessment procedures; 3. Level of training of regular education teachers to work with diverse learning styles; 4. Level of skill of teaching staff in managing behavior in the classroom.
χ90%	Percent of evaluations completed within 60 days of consent to evaluate.
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	 Use of the new evaluation/reevaluation procedures to the fullest extent; Number of evaluation staff; Role assignments of evaluation staff; Method of tracking progress of evaluations;
	5. Other impinging factors.
100%	Percent of reevaluations completed within 3 years of the prior evaluation.
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	System of tracking due dates of reevaluation;
	Lead time to begin the reevaluations;
	Use of new reevaluation procedures to the fullest extent;
	4. Number and roles of the evaluation staff;
	Involvement of parents in the evaluation process.

Standard	Performance Indicator
χ75%	Percent of parents reporting their student is progressing satisfactorily toward IEP goals.
	Analysis: Before addressing this PI, the LEA must determine if students are meeting IEP goals at a rate at or greater than 75%. If so, the LEA should consider the following: 1. Adequacy of the LEA parent outreach, education, and information
	program; 2. Structure of the progress reports submitted to parents; 3. Parent-teacher communication systems.
	If the goal achievement of students does not reach 75%, the perceptions of the parents should be considered accurate and the LEA should address improving student achievement. Refer to the following two performance indicators.
χ75%	Percent of IEP goals aligned with State Standards.
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	 General level of knowledge and use of standards within the LEA; Involvement of special education staff in standards training; Intensity of efforts to inform parents of students with disabilities about the standards;
	Adequacy of IEP development training for parents and staff.
χ75%	Percent of IEP goal attainment.
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	Alignment of goals to state standards;
	Appropriateness and specificity of present levels of educational performance:
	performance; 3. Alignment of goals with present levels of education performance;
	Level of specialized instruction and support available to students with disabilities;
	5. Level of support and training available to both regular education and
	special education staff;
χ75%	 Effectiveness of teaching strategies being employed. Percent of students participating in statewide assessments (AIMS or Stanford 9).
χ1370	1 creent of students participating in statewide assessments (Alivie of Staniord 5).
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the IEP
	team understanding of:
	1. The requirements of the law;
	The availability of test adaptations (accommodations and modifications);
	3. The impact on students of not participating in statewide testing.
	4. The impact on educational quality when students with disabilities do not participate.

Standard	Performance Indicator
α30%	Percent of students who are removed from the regular classroom for more than 60% of their school day.
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	 The range of available placement options by disability category; Training of regular education and special education staff on effective inclusion practices;
	Training of staff on positive behavioral supports;
	4. General school climate related to students with disabilities;
	Parent support/knowledge regarding inclusive education.
χ90%	Percent of special education teachers fully certified.
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	Recruitment efforts within the past 3 years;
	2. Pay scale and incentives;
	3. Career development support by the LEA; 4. Participation in SELECT or other university outroach programs:
χgeneral	 Participation in SELECT or other university outreach programs; Graduation rate for special education students.
population	Craduation rate for special education students.
рорололо	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	Alignment of curriculum with state standards;
	Participation rate in statewide assessments;
	3. Alternative education options, including vocational program availability;
	4. Adequate planning for course of study leading to graduation;
	5. Quality of transition planning through the IEP process;
αgeneral	6. Use of student lead IEPs; Dropout rate for special education students.
population	Analysis: See items under graduation rate.
χ75%	Percent of parents reporting active participation in the IEP process.
Λ. σ. σ	
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	LEA approach to IEP planning and scheduling;
	Parent training options related to the IEP process;
	General climate in LEA between parents and school;
	4. Adequacy of reports to parents of student progress;
	5. LEA use of PINS specialists;
	LEA supports for parent participation.

Standard	Performance Indicator
χ90%	Percent of parent participation in the evaluation (MET) process.
	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	Implementation of IDEA '97 evaluation procedures;
	LEA approach to evaluation planning and scheduling;
	Parent training options related to the evaluation process;
	LEA use of PINS specialists;
	General climate in LEA between parents and school;
	LEA supports for parent participation.
αgeneral	Suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities.
population	Analysis: If the LEA does not meet the standard, the team should consider the following:
	Availability of alternative education options;
	Training of staff on positive behavioral supports;
	3. The requirements of the law.